FUNDING FOCUS GROUP MEETING
May 6, 1999

Stakeholders Action Items:

Use feedback with EPA about ETV service delivery, plan partnerships with California agencies, and consider other trade associations and other counties.

- Targeted sectors for feedback (cleaners, electric utilities, etc.)
- Discussed value of "certification", limited duration with EPA.
- Active involvement in ITRC.

Certification / Recertification Action Items:

Define duration of certification, define guidelines for re-certification, visit sites for re-certification, consider flexible depth of evaluation, conduct technology demonstrations, and define measures of program's success clearly.

- Initiated streamlined re-certification procedure development as part of several projects.
- Informal discussions on flexibility in depth of evaluation.
- Used "decisions" when measuring program's success.

Quality Assurance Action Items:

Communicate clearly on quality assurance (QA) goals and provide flexibility for QA requirements.

- Convinced EPA to allow interviews under "other information section".

Outreach Action Items:

Convene a "graduating class" of vendors to ask a series of questions, take advantage of California's experience, link more closely with the state's Trade and Commerce Agency, established links with Trade and Commerce Agency's web site, consider flexibility in service provided, consider MassSTEP a good model for California to examine, remove the dominant obstacle of geographical limitation, consider other areas besides pollution prevention, and consider possible strategic alliance with ETV Metal Finishing pilot.

- Developed survey for aqueous cleaners vendors.
- Conducted meeting with Trade and Commerce regarding web-site.
- Discussed procurement with Department of General Services.
- Discussed geographic limitations with ITRC.
- Decided ETV's focus must be on pollution prevention.

Users & Customers Action Items:

Obtain funding for protocol/development through user groups, consider an annual fee for a "User's Mark", and identify your strengths and weaknesses to prioritize potential customers.

- Weaknesses –
  - Long timeline.
  - Decision uncertainty.
  - Costs.
  - No Remediation Exp.
  - Lack of guidance and protocols.
  - Lack of secure funding base.
  - Lack of cost evaluation.
- Strengths –
  - California standards.
  - Tiered permitting.
  - Broad focus.
  - Statutory requirements: O & M, H & S.
  - Public noticing.
  - Partnerships.
  - Experience.
  - Multimedia potential.

Miscellaneous Action Items:

Identify countries with environmental technology, move into sectors of remediation technologies where ITRC technical and regulatory expertise are available, capture policy initiatives, protocol clearinghouse, and target the technology area for emphasis.

- Reviewed ITRC technical and regulatory documents.
- Contributed to ITRC Verification Team Report.
- Put our protocol clearinghouse on the web.

FOCUS GROUP ON FUNDING
May 6, 1999

Notes

$ Evaluation Value added by Certification/Verification

- Conduct in-depth interviews with applicants for anecdotal information

- Number of companies lined up to get certified is one of the measures of value added

$ Obtain funding for protocol/development through user groups--or through their lobbying efforts to get government funds and through conveying their members to contribute to such efforts.

$ AUser=s Mark@ could have an annual fee

$ P2 could be an AAchilles Heel@ of program since is narrow niched--and ETV set up a separate metal finishing ETV pilot

- Possible strategic alliance with that pilot where we could offer values they can=t--e.g., tiered permits/certifications

- Protocol development through convening users of technologies in a category

- Reports prepared by DISC. possibly don=t need to be as Athick@--as long as files adequately documented to reflect decisions

- Convening a Agraduating class@ of vendors--to ask series of questions:

  - value added
  - program improvements
  - program economies
  - their view of affordability and completeness
  - use their feedback with EPA regarding possible changes in ETV service delivery.

- Strength of Cal/EPA program is defined duration of certification--is not one-time open-ended

  - Guidelines for recertification could be helpful
  - Site visits for recertification might be desirable

- Recertification--should be done only if:

  - $ it is an income stream for program, or

  - $ is used as a relationship-builder between the vendor and the program, or

  - $ the clients are requesting it.

- Analogy between

  - $ audited and reviewed--in Financing Commission and (when audit--you Ago down in the mine@) (when review--mostly paper review), and

  - $ assessment and verification - e.g., NJCAT

- Problem is--for all verification programs -

  - the lowest cost verification (to client) will win

  We--have to acknowledge that all kinds of standards exist--and we should establish what we are comfortable with--but we should not be the most rigorous of all the programs, because it would dry up for lack of clients

- Measures of Program Success are relative

  - The measures for Cal/EPA may be different than U.S. EPA=s ETV program. We need to define ours.

  - e.g., MA is tracking how much money companies with certified technologies make--not how many places have been cleaned up or technologies otherwise deployed.

- Identify countries with environmental technology verification programs and make sure they are aware of Cal/EPA certification program, and value if others--Phillippines, Singapore, Taiwan, Australia, South Korea, Indonesia. Will Kirksey (EvTEC) is preparing a report on APEC meeting.

  - Australia (CEC?)--public-private partnership was taking the lead

- Get Tim Ogburn=s shop more involved with us--to get us more international market data and keep us informed about movements--in Pac Rim--toward developing verification programs.

- Developing relationships with other verification programs--particularly state programs--would be an advantage to our program--e.g., in protocol development, agreements to accept data, etc.

- The more contacts and relationships we have, the more firmly established we will be.

- An area we should move into might be those sectors of remediation technologies where ITRC technical and regulatory guidance documents are now available--e.g., soil washing, permeable barrier walls, etc.

- We should try to better Acapture@ the policy initiatives we are already in--e.g., 6-State MOU, ITRC.

- Protocol Clearinghouse--badly needed for verification programs.

- Develop technology category protocol by:

  $ Convening group of vendors of such technologies--and ask them how their technology should be evaluated and verified. Bring in some vendors and public interest people as well.

- Lack of consistent protocols is a major log jam in verification efforts everywhere.

- Capitalize on relationship with CalTCA--get more and current information to Tim Ogburn..

  Also--try to get Web links established with TCA=s.

- Systematically ID the top environmental concerns in the State that have technological barriers--to target the technologic areas for emphasis.